DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 755 JC 020 767

AUTHOR	Perin, Dolores, Ed.
TITLE	Summary of Themes and Issues. 2001-2002 Seminar Series. New Roles of Community Colleges [and] Academic Preparedness and Remediation in Community Colleges [and] Dual Enrollment in High Schools and Community College [and] Accountability and Learning Outcomes in Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, NY. Community Coll. Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/~iee/ccrc/PAPERS/finalsummarySS.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Institutional Mission; Transfer Policy; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Macomb Community College MI

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the themes and issues presented at the Community College Research Center seminars between 2001 and 2002: (1) "New Roles of Community Colleges" (October 12, 2001); (2) "Academic Preparedness and Remediation in Community Colleges" (December 7, 2001); (3) "Dual Enrollment in High Schools and Community College" (January 25, 2002); and (4) "Accountability and Learning Outcomes in Community Colleges (March 22, 2002). The first seminar describes the complex nature of community colleges in terms of functions and constituencies. Five elements that form a foundation for successful community colleges are also discussed: (1) a clear focus on social purpose; (2) development of situational strategies; (3) provision of opportunity through open access; (4) emphasis on teaching and learning; and (5) concern for student success. The second seminar asked questions such as: (1) what are the most pressing issues in developmental education at the present time? (2) where should developmental education be going? and (3) what role can the community college play in preparing high school students for the academic demands of college? Critical questions addressed in the third seminar include: (1) how is dual enrollment typically used by community colleges? (2) what new policy initiatives are emerging concerning dual enrollment? and (3) what is the impact of dual enrollment on participating institutions? Issues were raised in the fourth seminar were: (1) what are the different forms of performance accountability that community colleges encounter? (2) what have been the forces driving the development of performance accountability? and (3) what have been the impacts of performance accountability on community colleges? Which of these impacts are intended and which desirable? (ND)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 755

COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESEARCH CENTER
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2001-2002 SEMINAR SERIES

Funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

SUMMARY OF THEMES AND ISSUES

Editor: Dolores Perin

In this document we summarize the issues and themes raised during a series of seminars conducted by the Community College Research Center. The purpose of this series is to provide a forum for researchers, community college leaders and others to discuss important issues affecting the role of community colleges in higher education. While we have made every attempt to capture faithfully the content of the presentations and ensuing discussion in each session, we regret any inaccuracies that may have occurred. We are grateful to Kerry Charron, Gretchen Koball and Vanessa Morest, who summarized the sessions, and to Tia Dole and Lisa Rothman, who assisted in coordinating the seminars.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Bailey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Contents:

October 12, 2001: New Roles of Community Colleges.....Page 1
December. 7, 2001: Academic Preparedness and Remediation.....Page 7
January 25, 2002: Seminar on Dual Enrollment.....Page 14
March 22, 2002: Seminar on Accountability.....Page 20

JC020767

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

October 12, 2001 Seminar
New Roles of Community Colleges

Moderator: Joseph Hankin, President, Westchester Community College
Introduction: William Baldwin, Associate Dean, Teachers College, Columbia University

Panelists:
Albert Lorenzo, President, Macomb Community College, Warren, Michigan
Thomas Bailey, Director, Community College Research Center

Introduction

William Baldwin, Associate Dean of Teachers College, introduced the session by describing the historic role of Teachers College in the community college movement. He pointed out that initially higher education researchers were reluctant to conduct research on community colleges, but noted that CCRC has accomplished achievements in this area. Baldwin offered his own observations of tensions within two-year institutions, in the communities they serve, and in the field of higher education research, based on his experience at a southeastern Michigan community college. He found that the values of a community college are not always the same as the values of the community, and that various constituencies may have a different perception of community college mission.

Panel Presentations

Thomas Bailey, Director of CCRC, provided an overview of the history of CCRC and its creation by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. He described the complex nature of community colleges in terms of functions and constituencies. He indicated that the trend was to for colleges to increase the number of missions to which they are committed, and did not foresee a change in this pattern. Bailey noted two main criticisms of the proliferation of community college missions: first, having multiple missions diverts attention away from the transfer mission, which some see as primary, and thus weakens this function; and second, the concern with transfer weakens another important mission, workforce preparation, by reducing the prestige, energy, and resources available for this function.

A breakdown of students' education goals was provided to help explain why community colleges had diverse missions. An important point was that 34% of students are seeking job skills, not degrees. Bailey cited several different perspectives on the role of community colleges. In the 1980's, Barbara Schneider (1999) claimed there was an increase in those who wanted to pursue a bachelor's degree. Patricia Cross (1995) focused on issues of efficiency, questioning whether any college can perform all functions with excellence. Breneman and Nelson (1980) claimed that colleges should focus on one mission. Frank Newman has argued that the steady addition of programs has led to a dispersion of resources and loss of focus. Bailey then described successful for–profit institutions that had a narrow focus. Examples were the DeVry Institute, an institution that provides only nine degrees, and the University of Phoenix, an institution that focuses on adult working students.

Bailey discussed some financial factors that have influenced the missions of community colleges. Considering the fiscal pressures, Bailey offered four broad reasons for why community colleges expand to new areas rather than focus only on their existing roles. First, a new function can generate new constituencies and resultant political support. These factors make presidents reluctant to shed functions. Second, some programs are believed to generate surpluses, providing crucial discretionary funds. Third, it seems to be easier to generate revenue from new sources rather than from expanding old ones. Fourth, it is easier to measure the revenue than the costs so colleges have little idea of the patterns or cross subsidies. Finally, multiple activities are believed to benefit students who are still exploring their interests and occupational choices.

In conclusion, Bailey made three predictions: the movement towards comprehensiveness will continue, there will be a greater focus on the core functions of teaching and student services, and community colleges will search for complementarities among functions.

Albert Lorenzo, President of Macomb Community College, described five elements that form a foundation for successful community colleges: 1.) a clear focus on social purpose, 2.) development of situational strategies, 3.) provision of opportunity through open access, 4.) emphasis on teaching and learning, and 5.) concern for student success. In discussing social purpose, Lorenzo stated that mature organizations often begin to place their own preferences ahead of the needs that led to their creation, even though colleges and schools are social institutions that should place society's needs and wishes ahead of their own. Regarding situational strategies, Lorenzo emphasized that community colleges should "mirror" the communities they were created to serve. Communities are becoming more dissimilar economically, demographically, politically, and culturally. Consequently, differences among colleges are growing, with more difficulty in framing a uniform definition, setting a common agenda, or envisioning a single mission. While the "open door" is a hallmark of the community college and positions them as "the people's colleges," the widening range of differences among the students coming through the open door is posing a major challenge. Lorenzo suggested that although options, pathways, and choices may need to be limited, open access to the institution itself must remain universal. The emphasis on teaching and learning is another hallmark of community colleges. He believes there will be a continued shift of emphasis from teaching to learning, but to a lesser extent than many predict. Technology will transform our concept of teaching and learning much faster than many community college leaders expect. Lorenzo stated that concern for student success is the community colleges' most laudable goal. However, it is the community college's most elusive goal, because multiple constituencies drive multiple and sometimes conflicting definitions of success. The single best measure is student goal attainment. However, students' goals may not be well aligned with society's needs. For example, there is a great need for skilled workers in manufacturing, but students are not interested in earning a living this way. There is a growing dichotomy between student interests and society's needs.

According to Lorenzo, current roles of community colleges include: preparation for transfer in the areas of arts and sciences, career preparation, community education, community enrichment, workforce and economic development, advanced education, and professional education and certification. Macomb Community College's missions evolved over time, and missions have been added. The college is organized in a way that reflects the various missions.

From 1954 to 1962 the college's mission was transfer in arts and sciences. Career preparation and community education were added during the 1960s. Then, in the 1980s, community enrichment and workforce and economic development were added. In 1991, a mission of advanced education was added, and recently, professional education and certification have been added.

Lorenzo discussed the influences on community college missions of the increasing demand for higher education, a need for "transitional learning," a need for remediation, a trend towards digitization, and an increase in commercialization. There has been a dramatic increase in educational attainment over the past few decades. Over 50% of the adult population now has some college experience. The rate of transfer from community to four-year colleges is 25%, which critics feel is too low and indicates a weakness in the transfer function. However, Lorenzo pointed out that only 25.6% of the U.S. population has a bachelor's degree or above. He suggested we should be asking *What does society need?* or *What does a democracy want?* instead of viewing higher transfer rates as the ultimate measure of success for community colleges.

There is an increasing demand for transitional learning by new Americans, displaced workers, out of school youth, prisoner education, and people who have recently experienced major life changes. The need for remediation is also growing. According to the National Center for Developmental Education, the percent of incoming community college students needing remediation is 38% in reading, 44% in writing, and 62% in math. Regarding digitization, more community colleges are offering on-line courses, web enhanced courses, and web-based transaction capability. Lorenzo reported an immediate interest in web registration at his college, especially by students in younger age groups. With respect to commercialization, Lorenzo predicted an increase in the marketing and the use of commercially prepared, high quality, web-based curriculum. Some companies are developing high quality tutorial software programs. Digitization and commercialization will redefine the concept of teaching and learning, and is doing so much faster than we may realize.

Community colleges will develop in response to these trends. New roles based on the demand for educational opportunities include improved access to baccalaureate degrees, legislative authority to grant degrees, the increased use of university center partnership models, articulation of online programs, continuing professional education, and post-degree certifications. New roles for transitional education include providing support similar to social service agencies, providing "neutral forums" for debate and resolution of local issues, and nurturing or sponsoring local civic leadership development initiatives. New roles for addressing the increased need for remediation include an expanded instruction in content-reading, writing, math and language proficiency, greater use of technology, possible outsourcing of some programs, and more collaboration for early intervention.

New roles based on digitization include new delivery systems using CD-ROM, server, and web-based sources, ITV and AV download, wrap-around and hybrid models, redefined tutorials models and redefined library models. New roles based on commercialization will require community colleges to act as brokers and distributors of commercially prepared curriculum. They will also act as learning consultants, and they will add value by matching

individual needs with the best products and tracking new options. They may become regional and possibly global providers and distributors in specialized fields.

Lorenzo noted that a century after the formation of community colleges, the U.S. has 1,151 regionally accredited community colleges, located within commuting distance of 90% of the nation's population, now enrolling 5.4 million credit and 5 million non-credit students. Community colleges of the past and those of today share a common purpose: "Junior colleges were designed to meet the needs of the average citizen in a changing world."

Audience Interaction with Panelists

A participant requested more information about Maccomb Community College's University Center Partnership. Macomb County is the largest county in the U.S. with no public university, but the county wants to have access to B.A. programs. Therefore, Macomb Community College made connections with three universities in nearby counties. Macomb provides the infrastructure and the universities provide the programs. This involved the construction of new buildings on the Macomb campus, which began in 1988. Today, the Partnership includes 11 university partners, 38 degree programs, and 2,300 students with a budget of $500,000. The Partnership is also becoming involved with continuing professional development, for example, for engineers. The Partnership is well received by students, and cost effective.

There was then some discussion about the percentage of community college students who go on to attain bachelor's degrees. On the one hand, more community college students say that they want to get BAs than actually end up transferring, so there seems to be some academic potential that the community college is not helping to realize. On the other hand, some students say they want a BA but do not intend to get one. Further, others say they want a BA and then change their goals later. Society's needs also have to be considered. Currently, 25% of the population has a BA or higher. Twenty-five percent of the community college population transfers to BA programs. Does this meet society's needs? The relationship between gross national product and degree acquisition was considered. That society's needs are met does not address the income disparity that is evident in our society. According to one participant, relative earnings of people who have BAs are 50% more than those who do not continue their education after high school.

The discussion then moved to the trends that Lorenzo described in his presentation. Regarding commercialization, a participant asked what the community college's role would be in delivering curricula that are produced by private companies. Lorenzo noted that there was competition from commercial providers of curricula, but also stated that community colleges have flexible and responsive faculty who provide high quality programs, and that faculty members drive excellence. Commercial products might be utilized when faculty were not "cutting edge."

There was then discussion of how community colleges are maintaining their integrity, and core goals and objectives, in light of the trend of increased outside partnerships and articulation agreements. The response to this concern centered around the idea that multiple

cultures, different "silos" with different cultures, were emerging at community colleges. Countering this view was the observation that research shows that the trend is to merge, challenging the notion of different cultures. Transfer agreements are developing more and more so there is a trend toward a "four-year culture."

The issue of defining internationalization was brought up. It was stated that internationalization has many meanings: recruitment from abroad, online courses with students who live abroad, or internationalization of teaching. Large numbers of community college students, for example 15% of students in the City University of New York sytem, were born abroad. Therefore, the term internationalization can also be applied to issues relating to immigrant students.

Next there was some discussion of how to measure success at the community college. Is success in the market place an appropriate measure of success? Is it based on student satisfaction? We need to agree on a definition of success first. Then, participants commented on services that the community college provides to the community, especially social services to the community, generally, and for high school students in particular. At community colleges, faculty will respond first to needs of their students; however, the colleges ensure that they have systems in place elsewhere that will respond to students' needs. Lorenzo indicated that Macomb has several community events focused on the needs of southeast Detroit, for example, an annual Halloween event that provides health screening for the community and also a family event at Easter.

The relation of community colleges to high schools was characterized as an emerging problem, with classroom management becoming a more pressing issue. The readiness of high school graduates for college was discussed. Community colleges test prospective students to determine readiness. Bearing in mind our open door policy, what do we do with students who are not ready for college – throw them out? The Middle College Program at LaGuardia Community College was described. This is a high school operated like a college (no bells, choice of schedule) where students obtain good preparation for the college environment.

Finally, a question was posed regarding what information community college researchers and practitioners felt they still needed about the roles of community colleges. In response, participants drew attention to the issue of why more people do not take advantage of community college programs, and the need for more quantitative data than is currently available from community colleges.

General Discussion Questions on New Roles of Community Colleges

1. What are the roles of community colleges in postsecondary education today?

2. What have the most important trends been with regard to community college missions during the past decade?

3. What factors are influencing these trends?

4. What major challenges lie ahead that are likely to shape community college missions?

5. What important organizational changes are occurring internally to community colleges as a result of new mission developments in the past decade?

6. How important are multiple missions financially to community colleges?

7. How well are community colleges succeeding at developing synergies between missions that have different clienteles, faculty and staff, and educational goals?

* * * * * * *

December 7, 2001 Seminar
Academic Preparedness and Remediation in Community Colleges

Moderator: Thomas Bailey, Director, Community College Research Center
Introduction: Arthur Levine, President, Teachers College, Columbia University

Panelists:
Byron McClenney, President, Kingsborough Community College, New York, NY
Hunter Boylan, Director, National Center for Developmental Education
Dolores Perin, Senior Research Associate, Community College Research Center

Introduction

Arthur Levine, President of Teachers College, began his introduction by stating that community colleges are the bellwether of higher education. He pointed out that phenomena such as changing national demographics, the new economy, and globalization have had primary impact on community colleges, which are now leading the way with new programs designed to meet the emerging needs of today's postsecondary students.

Teachers College has had a commitment to community college education since the time of the Truman Report (1947). For example, there are faculty who have expertise in community colleges, been awarded grants to study community colleges, and who have established a relationship with the Kellogg Foundation. The Community College Research Center continued the tradition beginning in 1996. Levine described CCRC's efforts to meet the need for research on community colleges, to create a new core of scholars to study community colleges, and to assemble a varied and talented group of researchers and students. Levine remarked that remediation is a profoundly important educational issue. Since approximately one-third of higher education students in New York State need some form of remedial education, it is imperative that we know more about issues related to this topic.

Panel Presentations

Byron McClenney, President of Kingsborough Community College, first became involved in the development of remedial education programs in 1968 at Denver Community College. In 2001, remedial education is more important than ever. McClenney feels there will always be a need for remedial education and appeals to community colleges to take it seriously. Remedial education can be a contentious issue in community colleges. In the college setting, faculty are often more interested in teaching higher education rather than remedial education. It can be a struggle for community colleges to do remedial education well.

McClenney compared students' composite SAT scores and graduation rates from different colleges and universities. At Kingsborough Community College, the average composite score is approximately 800. This is significant because, within the City University of New York, of which Kingsborough is part, a score of 960 indicates a readiness for college-level

instruction. Another factor that effects remedial education is that no more than one in six students is the "traditional" postsecondary student (i.e. full-time, 18-21 years old)

McClenney proposed some ideas for good practice in remedial education. Every incoming student should be assessed, and remedial placement is essential. Students are entitled to feedback on their assessments, and students who are not ready for college-level education should be advised to enroll in remedial education, even signing a waiver should they decide not to follow this advice. Colleges should be discouraged from enrolling students late in the semester. Starting late hurts the student's chances of succeeding, particularly students who are not prepared for college-level work. Finally, colleges should not allow students to enroll simultaneously in college-level and remedial classes. A seminar participant called attention to the fact that often businesses sponsoring students in their educational programs at community colleges do not want students to spend their time in remedial classes. Since this is unrealistic, McClenney felt that it might be better if community colleges did not do business with such companies.

Community colleges may suffer not from a lack of remedial services but a lack of coordination of services being offered to developmental education students. Not only is it difficult to coordinate amongst the various remedial programs, but it is difficult to establish consistency between exit standards for remedial courses and entry standards for college level courses.

Hunter Boylan, Director of the National Center for Developmental Education at Appalchian State University, began by addressing the question, "Where should developmental education be going?" He provided an overview of the recent history of development education. Between 1990 and 1999, a number of bills were proposed to relegate developmental education to the community college, and the majority of these were defeated. In recent years, there has been a modest trend to reduce remedial education at universities and to increase it at community colleges.

Boylan reconceptualizes developmental education as a service that helps transform mass education "from education for all to education for each." This involves considering the needs of each student and introducing alternatives to remedial courses. For example, some students may need to focus on test-taking skills. For others, tutoring while enrolled in college level courses may be ideal, while a five- or six-week "fast-track" developmental education course may suit yet others.

The quality of developmental education programs varies widely. Between 20% and 80% of students complete these programs, and 50% to 80% of completers pass their first college level course. Boylan offered a number of suggestions for improving the quality of developmental education including the use of learning labs; individualized instruction, coordination of developmental education services, and the evaluation of outcomes of developmental education initiatives. Boylan also recommends that assessment and advisement be informed by measurement of non-cognitive skills and learning styles. In concluding, Boylan recommended that advisors be better prepared to match student characteristics with appropriate learning experiences.

Dolores Perin, Senior Research Associate at CCRC, discussed research in progress on remediation and academic preparedness. The CCRC is currently half way through a three-year national field study of sixteen community colleges across the country. The project is looking at eight different research topics including remedial education.

This research is using a broad definition of remediation, which includes all efforts made by community colleges to help students increase their academic skills. Remediation thus includes not only developmental courses but other instructional formats including academic learning centers and modification of the college curriculum. The CCRC study seeks to determine how well prepared students at the study sites are for the college curriculum, whether there is a relationship between English language proficiency and academic preparedness, issues arising from assessment and placement policies, and instructional formats being used.

The community colleges selected to participate in the CCRC study reflect a wide geographical range, and varying levels of state control. They also reflect a mix of urban, suburban and rural colleges. The unit of analysis for this study is the college. Data are collected through interviews in a process of conceptually driven sequential sampling, as well as examination of college documents and institutional research data, and observation of classrooms.

Perin described some preliminary findings of the study of remediation. Eight of the total of 16 sites have been visited to date, so that findings might change with additional data. The study has found a widespread and growing need for remediation resulting from changes in demographics, and poor high school education. Some negative views of the quality of high school education have been expressed by community college interviewees. To determine the level of academic preparedness it is necessary to examine more than developmental course enrollments. Colleges are grappling with the issue of mandatory placement, and there is a tension among three factors: retaining students, maintaining a non-discriminatory remedial placement policy, and a commitment to academic standards.

There is an overlap between ESL and developmental education, and some students who do not speak English as a native language voluntarily enroll in remedial courses hoping to improve their English language skills. There seems to be a reciprocal relationship between instructional formats: if a college offers less developmental education, they seem to make more use of academic learning centers. Modification of the college curriculum is another way that colleges may address students' need for basic academic skills, in what Norton Grubb, who also works with CCRC, has called "hidden remediation."

Perin voiced a concern that the traditional developmental reading, writing and math curriculum was not preparing students for degree-credit courses in the content areas. Little attention seems to be paid to developing academic skills needed in career-focused education, a major interest of community college students. Finally, while remediation is increasing in its importance in community colleges, there is a lack of institutional research on this topic.

Audience Interaction with Panelists

A participant asked the panelists to say something about the continuum of remediation, and if this continuum would help a wider variety of students take advantage of developmental education. Boylan stated that even elite higher education institutions have some form of developmental education, and many techniques were designed for high level schools. The continuum recognizes that almost all students can use additional support. Most students are under- prepared in some way.

There was discussion of the effects of P-16 reforms on remedial education. So far, this reform has had little impact. The opinion was expressed that college placement tests are a legitimate 12th grade level test, but high school exit tests measure skills at the level of grade 9. This could, however, be tied into the mandatory nature of these tests. If everybody has to take the test, the standards must be lower. Less than half of students entering the 9th grade in New York City will graduate from high school within four years. New York City high school students perform poorly compared to the rest of the state. The same occurs at the community colleges. The most difficult to serve students come from urban and poor areas. The Regents test is reasonably appropriate in level, but the scoring rubric is not appropriate. Until the high school curriculum undergoes a major overhaul, there will be a need for remediation in community colleges. Poor results indicate both pedagogical and organizational challenges. A calm approach is needed to provide remediation for those who need it.

In response, Boylan asked, "When did we decide that the purpose of high school was to go to college?" Several participants commented that we must educate students more, and that society requires high skills.

The needs of various types of remedial students were discussed. Different strategies are required for adults, 18 year olds, and ESL students. An example of remedial education in nursing programs was seen as valuable. Many students enter nursing programs with poor reading, writing, and math skills, but their desire to become a nurse motivates students to persevere in developmental education courses, where others might drop out. Linking remedial education to a career plan is effective. A participant questioned connections between specific goals, educational pathways, and success in existing developmental education programs.

The discussion moved to the topic of how to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of developmental education. Boylan cautioned against studies of random samples of programs because they often emphasized average statistics, and tended not to highlight the statistics of variance. This variation in developmental education programs is important. Focusing on successful schools and best practice is also important.

It was suggested that ethnographic research design is a good way to evaluate developmental education programs. It provides a way to look at the process of remedial education and can focus on how students progress. Students' self esteem often increases with their success. Ethnographic design considers the context of programs and incorporates the "voice" of the student.

Another aspect of evaluating programs' effectiveness is determining if students have acquired core competencies. For example, in some K-12 programs, it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of preparation for higher education because of the wide-ranging abilities of students when they enter such programs. The difficulty in obtaining data in community colleges about developmental education programs and students was discussed. To make a serious effort to understand the programs, it is necessary to be serious about collecting good data and keeping better records.

The discussion moved to the importance of coordinating various developmental education services that are delivered at one institution. Simultaneous enrollment in college level and developmental classes is not necessarily detrimental if the classes are coordinated. "Writing across the curriculum" is an example of an approach that requires a high degree of coordination. It can become unpopular with faculty outside of the English and language departments, who may think the approach is needed because the English and language instructors are not doing their jobs effectively. Without being properly coordinated, writing across the curriculum will not work.

Learning communities are another example of an approach that can bring departments together. A participant asked, "How do you bring together disciplines that aren't necessarily wanting to be together?" McClenney discussed disseminating information about effective programs as a way of promoting integration between disciplines. Perin described research she has done at CCRC on academic and occupational integration studies that found that most colleges tended to select the most committed faculty to implement this type of reform. Many faculty feel overwhelmed by their work load. A participant emphasized the importance of reinforcing faculty who are working harder. It is also important not to rely only on enthusiastic faculty; there must be institutional support.

A comment was made that there ought to be external accountability for developmental education programs. Research is needed to determine how supporting remedial students is beneficial to society or how programs might reduce the need for social services. Finally, the issue of organizational change was discussed. Comments pointed to the need to determine where community colleges are in the process of changing developmental education. The need to collect data was highlighted.

General Discussion Questions on Academic Preparedness and Remediation in Community Colleges

1. What are the most pressing issues in developmental education at the present time?

2. Where should developmental education be going?

3. Have remedial curriculum and instruction been changing recently? If so, why?

4. What is the optimal approach to the preparation of recent immigrants for the college curriculum?

5. What is the relation of remedial education to adult basic education (e.g. GED instruction) in community colleges?

6. What role can the community college play in preparing high school students for the academic demands of college?

7. How effective is developmental education? Are the right outcomes being measured?

* * * * * * *

January 25, 2002 CCRC Seminar Summary
Dual Enrollment in High Schools and Community College

Introduction: Joseph Hankin, President, Westchester Community College
Moderator: James Jacobs, Associate Director, CCRC

Panelists:
Jeff Rafn, President, Northeast Wisconsin Technical College, Green Bay, WI
Neil Scott Kleiman, Director, Center for an Urban Future, New York, NY
Terry Orr, Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College and Senior Research Associate, CCRC

Introduction

Joseph Hankin, President of Westchester Community College, welcomed participants to the CCRC Seminar and briefly introduced the topic of dual enrollment in high schools and community colleges. He then introduced the moderator, James Jacobs, Associate Director of CCRC. Jacobs stated that dual enrollment is a growing area for community colleges, and has become somewhat controversial. He described some observations he had made at Macomb Community College, which two years previously had started a vocational academy. This sparked a debate among faculty. Some did not want to teach high school students, and some expressed concern over policy and organizational issues.

Panel Presentations

Jeff Rafn, President of Northeast Wisconsin Technical College (NWTC), provided an overview of K-14 connections at his college. Rafn described two dual enrollment options at NWTC. The *Youth Options* and *Youth Apprenticeship* programs are delivered district-wide by interactive television (ITV), on-campus courses, and on-line courses. Enrollments are rising in both dual enrollment programs.

Youth Options began in the FY 98-99 under a Sate statute. In order to enroll in college credit courses, students must be high school juniors or seniors in good academic standing and must have parental approval. Students may only enroll in courses not available at their high schools. The origins of the Youth Apprenticeship program can be traced to Wisconsin's School-to-Work program. Students complete hands-on career exploration, acquire job experience, and earn technical college credits. High school juniors and seniors take occupational course work and work in related jobs with a mentor as an on-site teacher. Youth Apprenticeships are limited to occupational areas such as auto technology and drafting-mechanical design developed through the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development.

Rafn noted that some tensions have arisen regarding the *Youth Options* program. Parents and high school personnel have different expectations for high school students compared to college students. High school personnel believe that NWTC should make more accommodations for high school students. However, college administrators have a different perspective. the student has a "right" to a high school education but not a college education.

In addition, the characteristics of some Youth Options students have posed some challenges. Some high schools "dump" students into the ITV courses offered through the Youth Options program. Some high school students require more nurturing because they may lack a mature attitude towards learning. Issues arise when high school course takers are mixed in with program students, who tend to be more focused and mature.

Rafn discussed some financial implications for high schools. For the high schools, dual enrollment presents unplanned expenditures. Some high schools feel they are forced to pay for college courses. For example, if students drop a course or program, the high school do not get refunded yet still must take responsibility for educating high school students. However, one benefit to high schools is that they can eliminate high cost, lab intensive programs and rely on NWTC to provide instruction.

The colleges are also subject to financial impact. Since students must be provided courses for which they qualify, NWTC may have to bump college students out of class or add additional sections. High school students learn that this is a way to get into popular programs without having to be on a waiting list. High schools may use the program as a way to provide costly lab-based instruction without having to make the investment.

Rafn listed some general criticisms of the dual enrollment. Students may be denied important social experiences that they would receive in high school. Further, some teachers, students and parents hold the perception that the college is "lowering the bar." People think that if high school students can go there, it must not be for the "smart" kids. This misguided perception presents a marketing problem for college recruiters. Also, some critics feel the community colleges are competing with high schools and that they use dual enrollment as a strategy to increase enrollment.

Rafn stated that dual enrollment offers several benefits to high schools. High-cost programs are made available to high school students. There is a wider selection of courses than might normally be found in smaller, rural high schools. Dual enrollment has increased interaction between colleges and high schools and has heightened awareness of academic preparation and expectations. Moreover, dual enrollment contributes to a greater understanding of the diverse programs available at a technical (community) college.

Neil Scott Kleiman, Director of the Center for an Urban Future in New York City, described his organization as a policy institute that blends journalistic reporting techniques with traditional policy research and analysis. Over the past two years, the Center has documented a large systemic increase in P-16 activity in New York City and in the country. Kleiman discussed the relationship between the City University of New York (CUNY) system and the New York City Board of Education, and particularly the large number of P-16 innovations. CUNY has a 25 year history of P-16 programs. The best known models include Middle College High School (which originated at LaGuardia Community College in the early 1970's) and Gateway to Higher Education, and these programs have been duplicated across the country.

Gateway to Higher Education started in 1986, growing out of the City University's medical school. The Gateway program targets students of color for undergraduate and graduate-level medical education and prepares them through an intensive science curriculum from junior high school through high school.

Kleiman reported that as of the 1999-2000 academic year, every CUNY campus had some form of a P-16 program. However, New York City did not have any type of system-wide P-16 coordination prior to the year 2000. At this time, there was an explosion of activity and expansion of dual enrollment programs. In that year, the city undertook a series of major reforms to expand existing programs and begin new initiatives to link the two educational levels.

Reforms included a major expansion of College Now, which began at Kingsborough Community College in the early 1980s. College Now is a dual enrollment program that allows high school juniors and seniors to take college-level courses for credit in their high school and at a CUNY campus. In 2001, the program expanded from six colleges to 17, and from serving 60 city high schools to 150. Over 25,000 students participated in College Now during the 2000-2001 academic year.

Reports issued by the Center for an Urban Future have concluded that individual leadership was the catalyst for expanding College Now. On the local level, Kleiman credited Morty Slater for the success of Gateway to Higher Education and Janet Liberman and Cecilia Cunningham for Middle College High School. Kleiman also described shared goals and strong rapport between Public Schools Chancellor Harold Levy and CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, which have contributed to public school/college collaboration. Kleiman suggested that this rapport represented a break in the "chilly relations" that have tended to exist between the chancellors of the two institutions. Historically, the chancellors of the Board of Education and of CUNY rarely spoke with each other. In contrast, Kleiman stated that the two current chancellors virtually created P-16 programs overnight without waiting for a Blue Ribbon Panel, official comment, and other approvals.

Although the Center's report, *Building a Highway to Higher Ed*, highlights positive aspects of the high school-college collaborations, there are five shortcomings in the implementation and administration of dual enrollment programs. First, most reports are done in the "cheerleading mode" and lack critical evaluation. Second, the independence of various CUNY campuses results in different concepts of dual enrollment. Colleges have chaffed against uniformity and assessment, and thus dual enrollment has developed differently on different campuses. Community colleges have been especially aggressive in establishing and expanding dual enrollment programs. Third, building relationships between colleges and high schools happens over many years. For example, it took a long time to establish Gateway and Middle College High School. Fourth, researchers and policymakers need to pay attention to connections that high schools have with private postsecondary institutions. Fifth, dependence on individual leadership is dangerous because if a leader leaves, dual enrollment may not be given the same priority by a successor. Kleiman expressed concern that some colleges are inventing dual enrollment as they go along, as in the case of College Now 9, a program developed for ninth graders because one individual leader thought it was necessary even though it was not well thought out.

Terry Orr, Senior Research Associate at CCRC, presented her research on the current trends and developments in dual enrollment. She defined dual enrollment as a process whereby high school students earn both high school and college credit for designated coursework.

Orr stated that the dual enrollment arrangement is defined by six main factors. These factors include: course content (existing courses or specifically designed); location (courses taught at high school or community college); instructors (community college faculty or qualified high school teachers); student mix (high school students alone or mixed with community college students); credits earned (whether earned as they go or after enrolling in community college program; the extent to which the credits are transferable to public and private institutions); and finance (whether the state pays both community college and school district for the FTE or only one and whether students pay some or all of the costs for tuition, fees, and books).

Orr then discussed several trends. Most community colleges offer some dual enrollment option. Most states have policies that govern dual enrollment, course and student eligibility, and how tuition is covered. Several education and social developments as well as other policy priorities are stimulating its use. These developments include raising educational standards, redesigning high schools to foster engagement and challenge, expanding educational choice and options, encouraging college-going for all students, and reducing the duplication between educational levels.

Dual enrollment programs typically serve academically advanced students who are ready for college-level work. Dual enrollment is usually offered for liberal arts courses, so it primarily serves primarily college-prep students. There is some debate about whether there are equity and access issues over its use, particularly since low- and moderate-achieving students might benefit even more from a supported college-going experience.

Orr listed some potential student benefits, such as shortened educational degree time, financial savings, improved college-going confidence, college readiness preparation, expanded educational choices and challenges that make high school more interesting.

Some institutional patterns for community colleges were noted. For example, dual enrollment is not a single entity, but can exist as a free-standing option or as part of a more comprehensive program. Community colleges may have multiple dual enrollment opportunities serving different students and purposes, with different requirements. Four patterns are identifiable at the community college. First, some dual enrollment options serve small numbers of students (no more than 20-30 per year). Second, some community colleges sponsor a well-organized, broadly defined dual enrollment program that serve a large number of students (about 1,000 a year). Third, dual enrollment is included primarily in workforce development programs, such as Tech Prep, and often as part of a sequenced program of study. Fourth, dual enrollment is included in programs for high-risk students, such as the Middle College model.

There are several potential benefits to the community college. Dual enrollment: 1) creates a new service market and income stream; 2) brings in more academically able students to the community college campus; 3) improves the public image of the community college serving

all students; and 4) improves the community college's recruitment of more academically able students into their traditional degree programs.

Dual enrollment also benefits secondary schools and their districts. These programs provide academically challenging, specialized courses; it is more cost-effective for high schools; it allows high schools to diversify course options and expand the boundaries of the high school experience; and it improves student engagement in high school, especially for seniors. In addition, dual enrollment can facilitate college-going, a positive outcome measure.

Emerging issues include improving the structure, coordination and communication of dual enrollment programs, filling in the educational continuum by linking dual enrollment options to degree programs, expanding dual enrollment to all curriculum areas, and making credit earning more transparent. Other issues that need attention include quality control, evaluation, and problem solving, and competition from four-year institutions. State policy developments should address concerns about double dipping, credit transfer, equity and access.

Audience Interaction with Panelists

A participant asked the panelists to what extent dual enrollment is geared towards academically advantaged high school students. Rafn answered that institutional data from community colleges across the nation show a tremendous increase in dual enrollment programs within the past 3-4 years, but most programs seem to be serving fewer at-risk students. Rafn noticed that the on campus courses offered through NWTC's dual enrollment program tend to attract more academically advanced students whereas some school districts inappropriately place (or "dump") some students into the ITV courses.

Kleiman indicated that some CUNY community colleges, such as Kingsborough Community College, are targeting at-risk students. Kleiman explained that since many New York City public school students have remedial needs, dual enrollment was established as a "backdoor way" to test students and provide remediation earlier, and then allow them to access a college education.

The panelists were asked if they foresaw a "train wreck" with the expansion of dual enrollment and Advanced Placement course offerings. Rafn answered that the future of dual enrollment would not be a problem for NWTC, but that the challenge is to figure out what addition in value can be offered to high school students. Orr claimed that a common complaint at sites with dual enrollment is that it draws away students who would otherwise take AP courses. A participant commented that the competition for students to enter dual enrollment courses versus AP courses depends on geographic location. Higher SES school districts tend to offer AP, whereas high schools in rural, low SES regions do not have AP courses at all.

Kleiman was asked to elaborate on his earlier statements regarding the improved relationship between the two chancellors, and whether Kleiman thought this relationship between the two offices would be institutionalized. Kleiman suggested that this process would take some time, and that educators need to be pay careful attention to how programs are implemented. He expressed some concern about administrators from CUNY and the New York City Public School

District not moving fast enough administratively and programmatically for the programs to have longevity.

One participant wondered whether there had been a backlash regarding funding of these programs. This led to a discussion of the perception of "double dipping." Rafn stated that NWTC makes no money on dual enrollment, and he pointed out that NWTC's primary reason for getting involved in dual enrollment is to provide educational opportunities to students in rural areas.

A participant asked who was conducting research into dual enrollment. Orr responded that most research is conducted internally by institutions. Some do careful studies regarding credit earned, or focus on local policy issues regarding access and equity, but there is a limited amount of longitudinal data to see where students go after participating in the dual enrollment program and graduating from high school.

Another participant wondered whether dual enrollment programs were being used to recruit academically advanced students as a marketing strategy. Does it attract students who would otherwise go to a four-year college? Kleiman claimed that community colleges are not marketing to high schievers but are responding to a need.

There was a discussion of the impact on students in terms of time to degree, and reduction in tuition. Orr pointed out that colleges do not follow through on researching the benefits to students. Many states are looking at dual enrollment as a financial resource and a way to reduce tuition costs. The trend in courses offered was discussed. Colleges are often restricted in what they can offer by state policy; for example, North Carolina community colleges cannot offer any course that already exists in the high school. Orr stated that dual enrollment courses are often a component of a larger program such as workforce development.

General Questions

- How is dual enrollment typically used by community colleges? Is it affecting their traditional programs and services?
- What new policy initiatives are emerging concerning dual enrollment?
- What is the impact of dual enrollment on participating students?
- What are the primary institutional, educational and public criticisms of dual enrollment? Are there important advantages for community colleges?
- What is the impact on public funding for education? Are there any efficiencies or reductions in educational funding for remediation or higher education generally?

* * * * * *

March 22, 2002 Seminar
Accountability and Learning Outcomes in Community Colleges

Moderator: Vanessa Smith Morest, Assistant Director for Postsecondary Research, CCRC
Introduction: James Jacobs, Associate Director, CCRC

Panelists
Holly Moore, President, Shoreline Community College
Sandra Ruppert, Consultant, Educational Systems Research
Kevin Dougherty, Senior Research Associate, CCRC

Introduction

James Jacobs, Associate Director, CCRC, welcomed the group at this, the final meeting in the seminar series held in 2001-2002 by the Community College Research Center. He introduced each of the speakers, and invited participants to complete an evaluation form that was handed out (see http://www.tc.columbia.edu/ccrc/seminarsurvey.html). He indicated that CCRC may conduct another series of research discussions next year, and stated that he looked forward to receiving comments and suggestions by way of the evaluation form that would be taken into consideration when planning future meetings. He then introduced Vanessa Smith Morest, who went on to moderate the session.

Panel Presentations

Sandra Ruppert is a Consultant for Educational Systems Research, and also serves as a Program Director for the Center for Community College Policy, Education Commission of the States. Her presentation was entitled "The Good News and the Bad News: Accountability is Here to Stay." She stated that accountability can be a very powerful policy tool that can help institutions identify priorities and areas of improvement. However, in some cases accountability can be detrimental and send institutions in the wrong direction. For example, in response to retention and completion measures an institution might admit only students who are likely to succeed.

Ruppert posed three questions: What are the primary forces influencing state accountability agendas? What is the current status of state level policy for postsecondary accountability? What are the characteristics of an effective accountability system?

Ruppert named several influences driving states' postsecondary accountability agenda. To start, K-12 accountability is a high profile issue. One cannot read the newspaper without finding articles on the state of K-12 education. Almost all states have some form of K-12 accountability policy in place. Thirty-one governors addressed K-12 accountability in the 2002 State-of-the-States report, indicating that this issue is perceived as of critical importance. The public is highly interested in making schools accountable. There is an increasing focus on student achievement. Performance based accountability has come to mean testing, which has

implications for students, teachers and schools. In some cases, high schools are requiring exit exams. Consequences of accountability measures include both rewards and sanctions.

Further, postsecondary accountability is a part of statewide government reform efforts. State governments feel the need to be more efficient and effective. Ruppert described a "reinventing government" effect. Accountability performance and results are hallmarks of state policy and state government. Not only postsecondary education, but hospitals, prisons, and schools are also asked to be accountable and do more with less without diminishing quality. In the last 7-8 years there was an increase in absolute dollars allocated to higher education, but at the present time it is facing hard times and must go back to doing more with less. Measuring performance by outcomes is a way by which some hope to achieve greater results for less money. A key feature of this approach is the "horse trade" in which institutions are granted more flexibility and autonomy in making decisions in exchange for greater accountability.

Another influence on states' postsecondary accountability agenda is what Ruppert described as a collision of the rise in state and societal needs with decline in state resources. At this time, higher education is particularly important for economic and workforce development. Finally, there is a growing interest in assessing state-level performance, such as reported in the document *Measuring Up 2000* (for more information go to http://measuringup2000.highereducation.org/).

Ruppert went on to present some ideas about postsecondary education's role in the new economy. States and society need postsecondary education to strengthen and diversify the economy, prepare a highly-skilled workforce, and raise levels of educational attainment. The need for postsecondary education conflicts with economic realities such as the current fiscal crisis in the states, competing priorities for resources, and postsecondary education as the "budget balancer." Higher education is seen as an engine of economic development and community colleges play an increasingly key role in preparation of the labor force, including high skill training. Ruppert pointed out that most state policy makers realize that we need to bring up the bottom third of the general population in terms of educational and workforce opportunities. In the eyes of knowledgeable and influential policy makers, community colleges play a critical role. However, the good times, when states invested heavily in postsecondary institutions, are ending. Institutions are increasing tuition and there is concern that access will be limited.

Ruppert described a growing interest in assessing state-level performance. The report *Measuring Up 2000* has drawn attention to comparing performance between and among states. This assessment, conducted by the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education, features a profile of each state, and has gained the attention of many policy makers. The assessment produced report cards that measure performance in six graded categories: preparation, participation, affordability, completion, benefits, and learning. Grades are calculated based on 30 quantitative performance indicators. According to this report card, every state received an "incomplete" in student learning. In the 1980's attention was focused on general education and student learning. Over the years, the focus has drifted away from classroom assessment and has moved to "proxy" measures. *Measuring Up 2000* put the focus back on student learning.

Ruppert then discussed the current status of state level policy for postsecondary accountability. State level interest in postsecondary accountability continues to grow. The focus tends to be on institutional performance as opposed to statewide performance. Thirty-six states link performance to the budget. Thirty-nine states require performance reports. Only five (Delaware, Indiana, Montana, New Hampshire, and Vermont) do neither. Ruppert cited the work of Joseph Burke of SUNY's Rockefeller Institute, who has found that each year more states are interested in "accountability with teeth," even though the amount of funding still tends to be small.

Ruppert stated that accountability policies are designed to serve multiple purposes, but they sometimes send institutions in the wrong direction. These policies can monitor "return on investment," inform planning or budgetary decisions, help to identify areas for improvement, and assess progress on state priorities.

Ruppert then discussed measures. Accountability is about performance, efficiency, and results. "Data availability" is a major factor in selection of measures. Eighty percent of institutions need to collect new data if they are going to use current measures. Quantitative measures are most common, since they are the easiest way to measure outcomes. Ruppert listed the 15 most common performance indicators and the 15 most common community college indicators, including graduation rates, transfer rates, and satisfaction studies (Ruppert provided a handout listing these indicators). She pointed out that the indicators measure outcomes, not process.

Ruppert stated the impacts of accountability are mixed. It is unclear how they contribute to institutional performance. Accountability measures are mostly developed by state policy makers for policy makers. These measures need to inform the future, and not just the past. Selection of measures may preclude important issuese. Performance measures need a benchmark, because otherwise it is not clear what indicators are supposed to measure.

Finally, Ruppert described some ideal characteristics of accountability systems. Accountability measures should make overall objectives clear, develop appropriate measures, connect reporting to funding and incentives, and provide audiences with information they need in a form they can use.

Holly Moore, President of Shoreline Community College, discussed the statewide process of developing performance measures in Washington. She distributed handouts that outlined the developments in Washington State's accountability system and explained how the performance measures impacted Shoreline CC.

Moore explained that talk about developing performance measures began in the mid to late 1980's as institutions became more focused on outcomes. Shoreline CC used the "Alverno" model for assessing student learning. At that time the state increased funds to spend on outcomes assessment. In the state of Washington, community and technical colleges are funded differently from other states. Washington has no state taxes, no levies, and no bonds. The state appropriation for community colleges is lower than four-year colleges by two-thirds to a half.

When they they began to implement accountability measures, the state held back appropriations until institutions met the performance objectives. If they did not meet them in one of four areas (wage earnings, transfer rates, completion rates, graduation rates), the institution did not receive funding.

Moore referred to several documents and pointed out some areas of interest. At the top of the first page of "Performance Funding for Improvement," it is written that the state will set a target for an increase in average wages. In Eastern Washington is predominantly agricultural, with migrant workers who earn roughly $6 per hour. In the Shoreline CC (Seattle) area, workers earn about $10.33 an hour. The Western Washington community colleges have been pushed by the state into aiming for a $14 an hour wage for their graduates in order to offset the lower wages in the eastern part of the state. Another goal was to increase the rate of transfer from community to four-year college to 67%. In connection with this, the state began to push not for preparation for transfer but actual transfer.

Approximately one-third of the community colleges colleges in Washingon failed to meet the state's educational attainment measures at the end of the first and second years. Shoreline CC was low on graduation measures. As a result, the state held back money. There was strong dissatisfaction around the state because the measures were considered invalid. In response, the CC presidents got together and urged the state board to consider changes. A system task force comprised of practitioners from around the state was created to examine academic performance. In turn, the state board lobbied the legislature to allow institutions some flexibility and autonomy.

In 2000, a biannual assessment program was established and performance reporting rather than performance funding was implemented. The statewide task force adopted measures of workforce preparation, college transfer, and basic academic skills achievement, and removed the connection between reporting and funding. The task force began modularizing the curriculum.

Shoreline CC has been meeting and even exceeding state performance goals. Recently, the college has accelerated the process and revised its accountability measures. In closing, Moore stated that it is difficult for the college to sustain interest in meeting performance goals in the lack of incentives.

Kevin Dougherty, Senior Researcher at the CCRC, introduced that his presentation by noting that he would touch on issues raised earlier by Ruppert and Moore. Dougherty agreed with the two previous presenters that accountability is a spreading phenomenon. He identified various forms of accountability and noted that there has been a move from input to output measures. Further, there are different kinds of connections between performance and funding: performance reporting, performance budgeting, and performance funding. Accountability systems are imposed by both governmental (state and federal) and private (regional accrediting associations) agencies. These systems can have immediate effects, including changes in funding, and changes in institutional awareness.

There are several origins of performance accountability. They include the state fiscal crises in the late 1980's and early 1990's, the wider accountability movement ("re-inventing government reform"), growing higher education budgets, pressure to expand higher education access, doubts about higher education's efficiency, and public unhappiness with postsecondary education. Community colleges were brought into the accountability movement after attention was paid to four-year institutions. As a result, many measures do not accurately measure what community colleges do. Additionally, performance measures may not capture the entrepreneurial nature of community colleges, in contrast to the more traditional functions of four-year colleges.

Dougherty stated that his research with CCRC indicates that, so far, the financial impact on community colleges has been minimal. However, community colleges naturally want to avoid losing money, so they are paying attention to the accountability movement and in some cases increasing and reforming their assessment activities. Community colleges are developing a clearer picture of state priorities. Measures are becoming codified and data collection activities are increasing. However, awareness of the influence of accountability measures on institutions varies. While presidents and vice presidents tend to be very aware of the impact of accountability measures, this awareness has not filtered down to deans and faculty members. According to one survey, 40% of deans and 60% of department chairs were not aware of the effects of accountability.

Dougherty distinguished intended from unintended impacts. Regarding intended effects, one-third to one half of the colleges are reporting a moderate effect with low levels of funding attached to reporting. These effects include increased monitoring and planning, initiatives to improve remediation and retention, increased attention to monitoring transfer rates, time to degree, and job training quality. In response to increased accountability, community colleges are developing more sophisticated data collection procedures and creating institutional research departments. Some community colleges are making data available online via the college website.

Some unintended consequences occur due to structural pressures. For example, some community colleges mentioned the possibility of their being tempted to reduce admissions of students who are less likely to succeed, or the elimination of courses or programs with low retention rates. Accountability measures could potentially force institutions to pay less attention to important but less rewarded missions.

Community colleges encounter many operational problems as a result of imposition of accountability measures. Standards sometimes conflict or the standards set are very difficult to meet. Measures are poorly designed. Funding problems arise (ex. formula elements and weights keep changing; funding does not rise with enrollments). Compliance creates additional financial burdens for colleges since data collection and usage are costly. Funding losses by community colleges that do not meet measures compounds problems.

Dougherty concluded with some recommendations. More money is needed to ensure compliance costs are met. Accountability systems should combat funding instability and design carefully thought-out measures. Institutions should be allowed time to get used to measures.

Policy makers should think of ways to provide strong incentives for students who are at risk of not completing. Dougherty stated that performance accountability is at an interesting juncture. He noted that it will be interesting to find out if accountability will continue in the future and in what form.

Audience Interaction with Panelists

A participant asked President Moore about the impact of Washington's accountability measures on Shoreline CC. The participant also asked if students entering Shoreline in different years noticed any particular changes. Holly Moore responded that when Shoreline first got accountability measures, the college quickly saw the need for an institutional research office. Accountability measures caused a big change on campus in terms of publicizing data. Shoreline conducts a strategic plan every other year in which faculty and staff look at measures and how they pertain to their area. They are linked to budget requests. Moore noted that students are aware of graduation outcomes, but they are not aware of individual accountability measures. The college has also revised their general education requirements with the implementation of measures.

Another participant then asked about measures that are driving the revision of general education requirements. Moore answered that they have increased general education requirements because of institutional self-study, not state requirements. Dougherty added that there is also an increased pressure to transfer more students.

One participant asked about the impact of pedagogy and the improvement of learning. Moore answered that since one goal is completion, her institution is looking at what is causing attrition and finding ways to eliminate problems. She stated that this topic suggests a need for professional development. Participants discussed the challenge of involving adjuncts in professional development.

A participant asked the panelists if they detected a renewed interest in research on teaching and learning. Ruppert noted that in the mid to late 80's there was an emphasis on student learning. Since then, accountability systems have focused on more easily quantifiable data. She predicted a resurgence in interest in classroom-based assessment. Moore added that Shoreline has started looking at the kinds of things affecting retention and noted the recent participation and interest in learning communities at her college. Pedagogical changes are occurring as a result. Moderator Vanessa Smith Morest pointed out that learning communities reach a small number of the total student body who may already have a good chance of success.

Participants discussed the role of accrediting agencies. One participant noted that accrediting agencies sometimes appear pitted against state systems. Their involvement in assessment highlights the need to find the right measures. Dougherty referred to the continuous change model and how the North Central Association's push to move institutions to systems of self-monitoring could have wide ramifications. A participant added that SACS has moved institutions to conduct self-assessment in a more data intensive way.

One participant referred to the "M & M model" of medical conferencing as a example of how community college professionals can address student attrition issues in a confidential, solution-oriented manner. Another participant pointed out some inconsistencies between a

medical setting and a postsecondary setting, noting that the challenges of a community college environment make it difficult to draw this analogy. A panelist also pointed out the heavy workload that accountability measures create for faculty who are assessing students. In addition, community colleges rely heavily on adjuncts that divide their time between several institutions and tend to be on yearly contracts, thus they may not be able to participate fully to assessment activities.

Participants discussed the evaluation of teaching and whether accountability measures will focus on faculty productivity measures. In healthier times, there was less discussion of assessment of teaching. One panelist pointed out that it will be interesting to see if the emphasis on teaching seen in the K-12 system would also be found in postsecondary education. Another participant mentioned that despite a substantial amount of research on pedagogy, the jury is still out on what makes an effective teacher.

One participant asked to what extent the Internet has impacted the dissemination of assessment data, particularly to consumers or potential students. In Washington state, each college posts results on a state website. One panelist suggested that this information could convey to the marketplace a college's services and successes and could be the real promise of performance measures.

The issue of a debate around student learning outcomes, testing, and the possible use of proxy measures was raised. One participant stated that legislatures are responding to anecdotal information with testing measures. Participants discussed how learning assessment should measure other outcomes besides completion to get a clear picture of student learning. Moore explained Shoreline's used of the Alverno model of assessment. Another participant mentioned that SUNY is now trying to figure out how to measure learning outcomes in general education courses because of the Board of Trustees' interest in this issue. Participants discussed the use of portfolios by some institutions to assess whether or not a student is a successful graduate.

General Questions

1. What are the different forms of performance accountability that community colleges encounter?

2. What have been the forces driving the development of performance accountability?

3. What have been the impacts of performance accountability on community colleges? Which of these impacts are intended and which desirable?

4. To the degree there have been undesirable impacts, in what ways and through what means should performance accountability systems be modified?

* * * * * * *

References

Breneman, D. W., & Nelson, S. C. (1980). The community college mission and patterns of funding. In D. W. Breneman, & S. C. Nelson (Eds.), *New directions for community colleges* (pp. 73-81). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. Patricia. (1985). Determining missions and priorities for the fifth generation. Pp. 34-52 in *Renewing the American community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership*, edited by W. L. Deegan and D. Tillery. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. & Stevenson, D. (1999). *The ambitious generation: America's teenagers motivated but directionless*. Yale University Press: New Haven, CT.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").